

In the Claims

Claims are amended as follows:

1. (currently amended) A method of planning a telecommunications data network which is capable of passing packet based data traffic therethrough, the method of planning comprising: determining a plurality of requirements comprising a specification for the ~~planned~~ data network; determining factors which effect the passage of ~~said~~ packet based data traffic through the ~~planned~~ specified network; modelling the performance of the ~~planned~~ specified network based on said requirements and said factors; comparing the modelled performance of the ~~planned~~ specified network with an objective comparison model comprising a model derived from objective measures calibrated by subjective tests; responsive to said step of comparing the performance of the ~~planned~~ specified network with the objective comparison model, iteratively adjusting said factors to improve the performance and maintain the network requirements of the ~~planned~~ specified network; and outputting a plan of the specified network.

2. (original) A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said network requirements are selected from the group comprising quality, incentive, cut-price and combinations thereof.

3 to 6 (cancelled)

7. (previously presented) A method as claimed in claim 1, and embodied as software in machine readable form on a storage medium.

8. (previously presented) A method as claimed claim 1 or claim 2 or claim 7, wherein the method of planning comprises: specifying a bearer profile for the network; defining a protocol stack supporting said bearer profile; and determining a target voice quality for the network; wherein said target voice quality determination is effected as a trade-off between a set of voice quality benchmarks.

9. (original) A method as claimed in claim 8, wherein said voice quality benchmarks comprise clarity, incentive and cut-price.

10. (original) A method as claimed in claim 9, wherein said clarity benchmark is determined as voice quality as a primary factor.

11. (original) A method as claimed in claim 10, wherein said incentive benchmark is determined as any combination of quality, convenience, compatibility, portability, mobility and low cost.

12. (original) A method as claimed in claim 11, wherein said cut-price benchmark comprises a minimum price with a minimum acceptable quality.

13. (original) A method as claimed in claim 12, wherein a transmission rating factor is calculated for the network.

14. (original) A method as claimed in claim 13, wherein said transmission rating factor (R) is determined as

$$R = R_0 - I_s - I_d - I_o + A$$

where R_0 is a signal to noise ratio, I_s is the sum of real time voice transmission impairments, I_d is the sum of delayed impairments relative to the voice signal, I_e is an equipment impairment factor, and A is an advantage factor.

15. (original) A method as claimed in claim 14, wherein a budget allocation is determined from a combination of the transmission factor rating, the equipment impairment factor and a delay margin.

16. (original) A network plan prepared by a method as claimed in claim 8.

17. (original) A network plan as claimed in claim 16, and embodied in a digital signal.

18. (previously presented) A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said objective comparison model comprises an E-model.

19. (previously presented) A method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said network plan is output as a software product.

20. (currently amended) A network planning tool for planning a telecommunications data network which is capable of passing packet based data therethrough, the tool comprising: an input for inputting requirements of a specification for the planned network; an input for ~~determining~~ inputting factors which ~~determined to~~ effect the passage of said packet based data through the planned specified network; a modelling module for modelling the performance of the planned specified network based on said requirements and said factors; a comparer for comparing the performance of the planned specified network with an objective comparison model comprising a model derived from objective measures calibrated

by subjective tests; a feedback mechanism means responsive to an output of the comparer for iteratively adjusting said factors to improve the performance and maintain the planned specified network requirements; and an output for outputting a plan of the network.

21. (original) A network planning tool as claimed in claim 20, wherein said network requirements are selected from the group comprising quality, incentive, cut-price and combinations thereof.

22. (previously presented) A network planning tool as claimed in claim 21, wherein said network requirements include voice quality benchmarks comprising clarity, incentive and cut-price.

23. (original) A network planning tool as claimed in claim 22, wherein said clarity benchmark is determined as voice quality as a primary factor.

24. (original) A network planning tool as claimed in claim 23, wherein said incentive benchmark is determined as a combination of quality and low cost.

25. (original) A network planning tool as claimed in claim 24, wherein said cut-price benchmark comprises a minimum price with a minimum acceptable quality.

26. (original) A network planning tool as claimed in claim 20, and embodied as software in machine readable form on a storage medium.

27. (new) A network planning tool as claimed in claim 20, wherein said objective comparison model comprises an E-model.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.